1	HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP Mark C. Goodman (Bar No. 154692)	
2	Ethan A. Miller (Bar No. 155965) 3 Embarcadero Center, Suite 1500	
3	San Francisco, California 94111 Telephone: (415) 374-2300	
4	Facsimile: (415) 374-2499 mark.goodman@hoganlovells.com	
5	ethan.miller@hoganlovells.com	
6	Attorneys for Defendant BIMBO BAKERIES USA, INC.	
7	BIVIDO BITICEI CON, INC.	
8		
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
10	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
12	ALEX ANG and LYNN STREIT, individually) Case No. 13 Civ. 1196 (WHO) and on behalf of all others similarly situated,	
13) RESPONSE OF DEFENDANT BIMBO Plaintiffs, BAKERIES USA, INC. TO PLAINTIFFS'	
14	FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS	
15	BIMBO BAKERIES USA, INC.,	
'16	Defendant.	
17		
18)	
19)	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

PROPOUNDING PARTY: PLAINTIFFS ALEX ANG and LYNN STREIT
RESPONDING PARTY: DEFENDANT BIMBO BAKERIES USA, INC.
SET NO.: ONE

Pursuant to Rules 26 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, defendant Bimbo Bakeries USA, Inc. ("BBUSA") hereby serves these responses and objections to the plaintiffs' requests for production of documents.

GENERAL OBJECTIONS

1. BBUSA objects to the definitions and instructions in the plaintiffs' requests for production of documents to the extent that they exceed the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

2. BBUSA objects to each of the plaintiffs' discovery requests to the extent that it purports to seek information or documents protected from discovery or disclosure by the attorney-client privilege, the attorney work product doctrine, the settlement or mediation privilege, the joint defense or common interest doctrines or by any other applicable privilege, immunity or protective doctrine. BBUSA intends to and does invoke these privileges and immunities with respect to all covered information and documents. Should BBUSA provide any privileged or protected information or documents during the course of this litigation, unless expressly stated otherwise, such disclosure is inadvertent and shall not constitute a waiver of any applicable privilege or immunity, or of any other ground for objecting, or of BBUSA's right to object during this litigation or otherwise to the use of such information or documents.

3. BBUSA objects to each of the plaintiffs' discovery requests to the extent that it seeks information or documents that, if disclosed, would violate third-party privacy rights or third-party confidentiality rights (contractual, common law, statutory or otherwise) or any rights that prohibit BBUSA from disclosing third-party information or documents without consent.

4. BBUSA objects to each of the plaintiffs' discovery requests to the extent that it purports to require BBUSA to disclose information that is commercially sensitive, confidential, proprietary and/or reflective of trade secrets, including, but not limited to, BBUSA's

9

12

13

11

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22 23

25

24

26

27 28 commercially sensitive, confidential and proprietary information and information that is prohibited from disclosure by contract, agreement, understanding, custom, trade usage, statute, regulation, privacy law and/or any other provision of law.

- 5. BBUSA objects to each of the plaintiffs' discovery requests to the extent that it is overbroad, unduly burdensome or seeks the disclosure of information or documents neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending action nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action.
- 6. BBUSA objects to each request on the basis that the plaintiffs have failed to satisfy their obligation to meet and confer with BBUSA about the discovery required and sought in this litigation prior to propounding discovery on BBUSA, as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26.
- 7. Discovery in this litigation is ongoing and BBUSA's responses are made only on the basis of the information that is currently known or reasonably available to it. These responses are made without prejudice to BBUSA's right to introduce additional evidence at the time of trial or to supplement its responses, as appropriate, as discovery proceeds and after discovery has been completed. BBUSA also reserves the right to make any use of, or to introduce in any hearing or at trial, documents or information subsequently produced or disclosed in this action.
- 8. The disclosure of any documents or information by BBUSA in response to this discovery is made subject to all objections as to competence, relevance, materiality, admissibility and any other objections on any grounds that would require exclusion of the documents or information, or any portion thereof, if such documents or information were offered into evidence. BBUSA expressly reserves all such objections and grounds.

RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

Subject to and without waiving the above General Objections, BBUSA hereby responds to each request for production as follows:

REQUEST NO. 1:

All documents relating to the labelling and packaging of the Purchased Products or the Substantially Similar Products.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 1:

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because the documents that it seeks are not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation.

REQUEST NO. 2:

All documents relating to compliance with food labelling requirements in the FDCA, FDA regulations, or the Sherman Law.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 2:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad, unintelligible and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because the documents that it seeks are not limited in scope or time. Since BBUSA complies with food labeling requirements, this Request could literally require production of every document in BBUSA's possession. If that is not what the Request is seeking, then it is unclear what the Request means by "compliance with food labeling requirements." BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents.

REQUEST NO. 3:

All documents relating to Bimbo policies, guidelines, or protocols relating to compliance with food labelling requirements in the FDCA, FDA regulations, or the Sherman Law.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 3:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because the documents that it seeks are not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged policy documents from the Class Period in its possession, custody or control, if any such documents exist, which relate to the provisions of the FDCA, FDA regulations, and the Sherman law that are at issue in this lawsuit.

REQUEST NO. 4:

All communications with the FDA relating to the labelling or packaging of products.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 4:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because the documents that it seeks are not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents

responsive to this request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 5:

TELOCEDI IIO. B

All documents relating to compliance with food labelling requirements in the FDCA, FDA regulations, or the Sherman Law that relate to the Purchased Products or the Substantially Similar Products.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 5:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because the documents that it seeks are not limited in scope or time. Since BBUSA complies with food labeling requirements, this Request could literally require production of every document in BBUSA's possession. If that is not what the Request is seeking, then it is unclear what the Request means by "compliance with food labeling requirements." BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. In addition, BBUSA objects that this Request is duplicative of Request No. 2.

REQUEST NO. 6:

All documents relating to Bimbo policies, guidelines, or protocols relating to compliance with food labelling requirements in the FDCA, FDA regulations, or the Sherman Law that relate to the Purchased Products or the Substantially Similar Products.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 6:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because the

documents that it seeks are not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. In addition, BBUSA objects that this Request is duplicative of Request No. 3. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation.

REQUEST NO. 7:

All documents relating to use of the phrase "100% whole wheat" on food labels or packaging.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 7:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because it is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 8:

All documents relating to use of the phrase "100% whole wheat" on Sara Lee Classic 100% Whole Wheat Bread, Sara Lee 100% Whole Wheat Bread, or any products listed in paragraph 203 of the SAC.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 8:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because it is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents from the Class Period responsive to this request relating to the products purchased by the plaintiffs, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 9:

Documents sufficient to show all ingredients in Sara Lee Classic 100% Whole Wheat Bread, Sara Lee 100% Whole Wheat Bread, and all products listed in paragraph 203 of the SAC.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 9:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because it is not limited in scope or time. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation.

REQUEST NO. 10:

All documents relating to the use of the statement on food labels or packaging that a product is a "good source" or "excellent source" of whole grain or whole grains.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 10:

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because it is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 11:

All documents relating to the use of the statement on Sara Lee Classic 100% Whole Wheat Bread, Sara Lee Soft & Smooth Whole Wheat White Bread, and Sara Lee Soft & Smooth Whole Wheat Bread that they are either a "good source" or "excellent source" of whole grain or whole grains.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 11:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because it is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at

issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 12:

All documents relating to the use of the statement on Thomas' Plain Bagel Thins that it is an "excellent source" of fiber.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 12:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 13:

All documents relating to the use of the Heart-Check Mark on food labels or packaging.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 13:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because it is not limited in scope or time. This Request literally seeks the production of all documents in any way relating to a Heart-Check Mark. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this request that

relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 14:

All documents relating to the use of the Heart-Check Mark on Thomas' Plain Bagel Thins or any products listed in paragraph 226 of the SAC.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 14:

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because it is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents from the Class Period in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 15:

All documents relating to the Heart-Check Mark program, including all communications with the American Heart Association.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 15:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because it does not define the "Heart-Check Mark program" and is not limited in scope or time. In addition, BBUSA objects that this Request is duplicative of Request No. 13 and seeks documents that are publicly available and/or equally available to the plaintiffs. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from

disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product
privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving
the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents from
the Class Period relating to the products still at issue in this litigation in its possession, custody or
control that are responsive to this Request, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 16:

All documents relating to the Heart-Check Mark certification process, including costs of certification.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 16:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. In addition, BBUSA objects that this Request is duplicative of Request No. 15 and seeks documents that are publicly available and/or equally available to the plaintiffs. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents from the Class Period relating to the products still at issue in this litigation in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 17:

All documents relating to the Heart-Check Mark certification of Thomas' Plain Bagel Thins or any products listed in paragraph 226 of the SAC, including costs of certification.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 17:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor

reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. In addition, BBUSA objects that this Request is duplicative of Requests No. 13, No. 15 and No. 16 and seeks documents that are publicly available and/or equally available to the plaintiffs. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged responsive documents in its possession, custody or control that relate to products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 18:

All documents relating to the use of paid endorsements on the labelling or packaging of food products.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 18:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action, as it is not limited in time or scope and does not define "paid endorsements." BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request and that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 19:

All documents relating to the use of statements on food products that they are "fresh,"

"baked daily," or "baked fresh daily."

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 19:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request seeks the production of documents relating to any and all "food products," which are undefined, at any time and seeks documents relating to statements that are not at issue in this litigation. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation.

REQUEST NO. 20:

All documents relating to the use of statements in Entenmann's Soft'ees or any products listed in paragraph 215 of the SAC that they are "fresh," "baked daily," or "baked fresh daily."

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 20:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action.

BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this request that relate to the products during the Class

documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 21:

All documents related to the use of added coloring in bread products.

Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 21:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because this request is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation.

REQUEST NO. 22:

All documents related to the use of added coloring in Bimbo Original Toasted Bread or any products listed in paragraph 198 of the SAC.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 22:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because it is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections,

BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation.

REQUEST NO. 23:

All documents pertaining to the issue of whether Bimbo Original Toasted Bread is bread.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 23:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. The Request does not define "bread" and is unlimited in scope and time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that there are no unprivileged documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.

REQUEST NO. 24:

Documents sufficient to show all labeling or packaging and all changes or variations in the labeling or packaging of the Purchased Products and the Substantially Similar Products over the past six years.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 24:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because it is not sufficiently limited in scope and the phrase "all changes or variations in the labeling or packaging" is not defined. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various

privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce the labels responsive to this request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation.

REQUEST NO. 25:

Documents sufficient to show all differences between the labels and packaging of Purchased Products or the Substantially Similar Products sold in California and labels and packaging of Purchased Products sold in other states since the beginning of the Class Period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 25:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous and unintelligible. Because the Request instructs that "and" means "or" and "or" means "and," it is unclear which products the plaintiffs seek to compare. In addition, this Request seeks information that is not relevant nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.

REQUEST NO. 26:

Documents sufficient to show the total sales of, revenues from, and profits from sales of each Purchased Product and Substantially Similar Product in California during the Class Period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 26:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because this Request is not limited in scope of time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Finally, BBUSA objects to this Request on the grounds that it is premature.

REQUEST NO. 27:

Documents sufficient to show the total sales of, revenues from, and profits from sales of each Purchased Product and Substantially Similar Product in the United States during the Class Period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 27:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action.

BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Finally, BBUSA objects to this Request on the grounds that it is premature.

REQUEST NO. 28:

Documents sufficient to show the wholesale prices in California of each Purchased Product and Substantially Similar Product during the Class Period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 28:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action.

BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents.

REQUEST NO. 29:

Documents sufficient to show the wholesale prices in the United States of each Purchased Product and Substantially Similar Product during the Class Period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 29:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action.

BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents.

REQUEST NO. 30:

Documents sufficient to show the retail prices and suggested retail prices in California of each Purchased Product and Substantially Similar Product during the Class Period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 30:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action.

BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Finally, BBUSA objects that the documents sought be this Request are as readily available to plaintiffs as they are to BBUSA. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that there are no unprivileged documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.

REQUEST NO. 31:

Documents sufficient to show the retail prices and suggested retail prices in the United States of each Purchased Product and Substantially Similar Product during the Class Period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 31:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Finally, BBUSA objects that the documents sought be this Request are as readily available to plaintiffs as they are to BBUSA. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that there are no unprivileged documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.

REQUEST NO. 32:

All consumer and marketing surveys, research, or analysis pertaining to any of the Purchased Products or the Substantially Similar Products (whether or not created by Bimbo or a Third Party).

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 32:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and it is unclear what is meant by "whether or not created by Bimbo or a third party." BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 33:

All consumer and marketing surveys, research, or analysis pertaining to the use of the phrase "100% Whole Wheat" on products (whether or not created by Bimbo or a Third Party).

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 33:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and it is unclear what is meant by "whether or not created by Bimbo or a third party." BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 34:

All consumer and marketing surveys, research, or analysis pertaining to statements that a product is a "good source" or "excellent source" of whole grain or whole grains (whether or not created by Bimbo or a Third Party).

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 34:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and it is unclear what is meant by "whether or not created by Bimbo or a third party." BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents

protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 35:

All consumer and marketing surveys, research, or analysis on the use of the Heart Check Mark on products (whether or not created by Bimbo or a Third Party).

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 35:

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and it is unclear what is meant by "whether or not created by Bimbo or a third party." BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 36:

All consumer and marketing surveys, research, or analysis pertaining to statements that a product is "fresh," "baked daily," or "baked fresh daily" (whether or not created by Bimbo or a Third Party).

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 36:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible,

overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and it is unclear what is meant by "whether or not created by Bimbo or a third party." BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 37:

All consumer and marketing surveys, research, or analysis pertaining to statements that a product is an "excellent source" of fiber (whether or not created by Bimbo or a Third Party).

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 37:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and it is unclear what is meant by "whether or not created by Bimbo or a third party." BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 38:

All consumer and marketing surveys, research, or analysis pertaining to the sale of food

3 4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

products to health-conscious consumers (whether or not created by Bimbo or a Third Party).

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 38:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and it is unclear what is meant by "whether or not created by Bimbo or a third party." BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 39:

All documents relating to the compliance or non-compliance of Purchased Products or Substantially Similar Products with labelling requirements of the FDCA, FDA regulations, or the Sherman Law.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 39:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because this Request is not limited in scope or time. This Request is also duplicative of Requests No. 4 and No. 5. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing

objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 40:

All communications to and from consultants, experts, or specialists in the area of food labelling requirements (whether or not employed by Bimbo).

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 40:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and does not define "consultants, experts or specialists". BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents.

REQUEST NO. 41:

All communications to and from consultants, experts, or specialists in the area of food labelling requirements (whether or not employed by Bimbo) that pertain to the Purchased Products or the Substantially Similar Products.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 41:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and does not define "consultants, experts or specialists". BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges,

including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents.

REQUEST NO. 42:

All communications to and from consultants, experts, or specialists in the area of food labelling requirements (whether or not employed by Bimbo) that pertain to the use of the Heart Check Mark.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 42:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and does not define "consultants, experts or specialists". BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents.

REQUEST NO. 43:

All communications to and from consultants, experts, or specialists in the area of food labelling requirements (whether or not employed by Bimbo) that pertain to the use of the phrase "100% Whole Wheat" on products.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 43:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and does not define "consultants, experts or specialists". BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges,

including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents.

REQUEST NO. 44:

All communications to and from consultants, experts, or specialists in the area of food labelling requirements (whether or not employed by Bimbo) that pertain to the use of statements that a product is a "good source" or "excellent source" of whole grain or whole grains.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 44:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and does not define "consultants, experts or specialists". BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents.

REQUEST NO. 45:

All communications to and from consultants, experts, or specialists in the area of food labelling requirements (whether or not employed by Bimbo) that pertain to the use of the phrases "fresh," "baked daily," or "baked fresh daily" on food products.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 45:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and does not define "consultants, experts or specialists". BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges,

including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents.

REQUEST NO. 46:

All communications to and from consultants, experts, or specialists in the area of food labelling requirements (whether or not employed by Bimbo) that pertain to the use of statements that a product is an "excellent source" of fiber.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 46:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and does not define "consultants, experts or specialists". BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents.

REQUEST NO. 47:

All insurance agreements applicable to the claims asserted in the above-captioned action.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 47:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, overbroad and calls for a legal conclusion. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that there are no responsive documents in its possession, custody or control.

REQUEST NO. 48:

All joint-defense agreements with one or more other food manufacturers relating to litigation of claims pertaining to the labeling or misbranding of food products.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 48:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because it is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that there are no unprivileged documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.

REQUEST NO. 49:

All other agreements with one or more other food manufacturers relating to litigation of claims pertaining to the labeling or misbranding of food products.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 49:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because it is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving any of the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that there are no unprivileged documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.

REQUEST NO. 50:

Documents sufficient to show when the phrase "100% whole wheat" was added to or removed from labels or packages of Sara Lee Classic 100% Whole Wheat Bread, Sara Lee 100% Whole Wheat Bread, and all products listed in paragraph 203 of the SAC.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 50:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action.

BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 51:

Documents sufficient to show when the statements on Sara Lee Classic 100% Whole Wheat Bread, Sara Lee 100% Whole Wheat Bread, Sara Lee Soft & Smooth Whole Wheat White Bread, and Sara Lee Soft & Smooth Whole Wheat Bread that they are either a "good source" or "excellent source" of whole grain or whole grains was either added to or removed from the labels or packages of these products.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 51:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action.

BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class

Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 52:

Documents sufficient to show when the statement on Thomas' Plain Bagel Thins that it is an "excellent source" of fiber was either added to or removed from the labels or packages of that product.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 52:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action.

BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 53:

Documents sufficient to show when the Heart Check Mark was either added to or removed from labels or packages of Thomas' Plain Bagel Thins or any products listed in paragraph 226 of the SAC.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 53:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 54:

Documents sufficient to show when the statement that they are "fresh," "baked daily," or "baked fresh daily" was either added to or removed from labels or packages of Entenmanns Soft'ees or any products listed in paragraph 215 of the SAC.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 54:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 55:

Documents sufficient to show when added coloring was either added to or removed from the recipe for Bimbo Original Toasted Bread or any products listed in paragraph 198 of the SAC.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 55:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action.

BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 56:

All sales, revenue, or pricing data for the Class Period relating to the Purchased Products or Substantially Similar Documents that were provided to Nielsen, Information Resources Inc., or other subscription services specializing in collecting such data.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 56:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that there are no documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.

REQUEST NO. 57:

Documents sufficient to show all SKU numbers of the Purchased Products and the Substantially Similar Products during the Class Period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 57:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible,

overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce a chart of SKU numbers for products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation.

REQUEST NO. 58:

All documents relating to the actual, potential, estimated, or expected differences between the prices of products that contain the Heart Check Mark and the prices of products that do not contain the Heart Check Mark.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 58:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because this Request is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that there are no unprivileged documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.

REQUEST NO. 59:

All documents relating to the actual, potential, estimated, or expected differences between the prices of products that contain the statement "100% whole wheat" and the prices of products that do not contain such a statement.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 59:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because this Request is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that there are no unprivileged documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.

REQUEST NO. 60:

All documents relating to the actual, potential, estimated, or expected differences between the prices of products that contain the statement that they are either a "good source" or "excellent source" of whole grain or whole grains and the prices of products that do not contain such a statement.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 60:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because this Request is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that there are no unprivileged documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.

REQUEST NO. 61:

All documents relating to the actual, potential, estimated, or expected differences between the prices of products that contain the statement that they are "fresh," "baked daily," or "baked fresh daily" and the prices of products that do not contain such a statement.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 61:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because this Request is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that there are no unprivileged documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.

REQUEST NO. 62:

All documents relating to the actual, potential, estimated, or expected differences between the prices of Bimbo Original Toasted Bread, the products listed in paragraph 198 of the SAC or similar products if they contain added coloring and the prices of those products if they do not contain added coloring.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 62:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because this Request is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work

product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that there are no unprivileged documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.

REQUEST NO. 63:

All documents relating to the actual, potential, estimated, or expected differences between the prices of products that contain the statement that they are an "excellent source of fiber" or and the prices of products that contain the statement that they are a "good source of fiber."

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 63:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action because this Request is not limited in scope or time. BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that there are no unprivileged documents in its possession, custody or control that are responsive to this Request.

REQUEST NO. 64:

All documents relating to the actual, potential, estimated, or expected differences between consumer interest in or purchases of products that contain the Heart Check Mark and consumer interest in or purchases of products that do not contain the Heart Check Mark.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 64:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and does not define

REQUEST NO. 65:

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

8

9

10

All documents relating to the actual, potential, estimated, or expected differences between consumer interest in or purchases of products that contain the statement "100% whole wheat" and consumer interest in or purchases of products that do not contain such a statement.

"differences between consumer interest in or purchases or products". BBUSA also objects to this

protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work

product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without

documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly

purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents

waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 65:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and does not define "differences between consumer interest in or purchases or products". BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 66:

All documents relating to the actual, potential, estimated, or expected differences between consumer interest in or purchases of products that contain the statement that they are either a "good source" or "excellent source" of whole grain or whole grains and consumer interest in or

purchases of products that do not contain such a statement.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 66:

. .

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and does not define "differences between consumer interest in or purchases or products". BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 67:

All documents relating to the actual, potential, estimated, or expected differences between consumer interest in or purchases of products that contain the statement that they are "fresh," "baked daily," or "baked fresh daily" and consumer interest in or purchases of products that do not contain such a statement.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 67:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and does not define "differences between consumer interest in or purchases or products". BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work

product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 68:

All documents relating to the actual, potential, estimated, or expected differences between consumer interest in or purchases of Bimbo Original Toasted Bread, the products listed in paragraph 198 of the SAC or similar products if they contain added coloring and consumer interest in or purchases of those products if they do not contain added coloring.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 68:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and does not define "differences between consumer interest in or purchases or products". BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS NO. 69

All documents relating to the actual, potential, estimated, or expected differences between consumer interest in or purchases of products that contain the statement that they are an "excellent source of fiber" or and consumer interest in or purchases of products that contain the statement that they are a "good source of fiber."

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 69:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope or time and does not define "differences between consumer interest in or purchases or products". BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will produce all unprivileged documents responsive to this Request that relate to the products during the Class Period allegedly purchased by the plaintiffs that are still at issue in this litigation, if any such documents exist.

REQUEST NO. 70:

Documents sufficient to show the total sales and retail prices of each Purchased Product and Substantially Similar Product at each supermarket chain and non-supermarket retailer chain with large grocery sections (e.g., Walmart, Target) in California during the Class Period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 70:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is duplicative of Requests Nos. 26, 28 and 30, and refers to BBUSA's objections and responses to those Requests, which are fully incorporated herein by this reference. Subject to and without waiving these objections, BBUSA responds that there are no documents in its possession, custody or control responsive to this Request.

REQUEST FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS NO. 71

Documents sufficient to show the total sales and retail prices of each Purchased Product and Substantially Similar Product at each supermarket chain and non-supermarket retailer chain with large grocery sections (e.g., Walmart, Target) in the United States during the Class Period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 71

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. BBUSA further objects that this Request is duplicative of Requests Nos. 26, 28 and 30, and refers to BBUSA's objections and responses to those Requests, which are fully incorporated herein by this reference. Subject to and without waiving these objections, BBUSA responds that there are no documents in its possession, custody or control responsive to this Request.

REQUEST NO. 72:

Documents sufficient to identify all Bimbo officers, employees, agents, and contractors responsible for compliance with food labelling requirements of the FDCA, FDA regulations, and the Sherman Law.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 72:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action.

BBUSA also objects to this Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work product privileges. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing objections, BBUSA responds that it will provide an organizational chart.

REQUEST NO. 73:

All documents relating to the difference in pricing between each Purchased Product and Substantially Similar Product and competing products during the Class Period.

RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 73:

BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full.

BBUSA further objects that this Request is vague, ambiguous, compound, unintelligible, overbroad and unduly burdensome and seeks documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of the pending litigation nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence in this action. This Request is not limited in scope and time and would require the

1 productions of virtually every document in BBUSA's possession. BBUSA also objects to this 2 Request on the grounds that it seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged documents 3 protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and attorney work 4 product privileges. BBUSA will not produce such privileged documents. 5 **REQUEST NO. 74:** 6 All documents that relate to, support, or refute any defenses Bimbo may have. 7 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 74:** 8 BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. 9 BBUSA further objects that this Request seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged 10 documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and work product privileges. In addition, BBUSA objects that this Request is premature, as BBUSA has not 12 yet asserted any defenses in this litigation, and fails to describe the documents it seeks with 13 reasonable particularity and, for that reason, this Request is fatally vague and ambiguous. 14 **REQUEST NO. 75:** 15 Any other documents that relate to the issues, facts, claims, or defenses raised in the above-captioned action. 16 17 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST NO. 75:** 18 BBUSA hereby incorporates the above General Objections as if stated herein in full. 19 BBUSA further objects that this Request seeks confidential, proprietary and/or privileged 20 documents protected from disclosure by various privileges, including the attorney-client and work product privileges. In addition, BBUSA objects that this Request fails to describe the documents 22 it seeks with reasonable particularity and, for that reason, this Request is fatally vague, ambiguous 23 and overbroad. 24 Dated: March 7, 2014 HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP 26 By: /s/ Mark C. Goodman Mark C. Goodman

11

21

25

27

28

Attorneys for Defendant Bimbo Bakeries USA, Inc.

1		PROOF OF SERVICE		
2	STAT	E OF CALIFORNIA)		
3	COUN) ss. NTY OF LOS ANGELES)		
4	I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen and not a party to this action. My business address is Hogan Lovells US LLP, 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1400, Los Angeles, CA 90067.			
5				
6 7	On March 7, 2014, I caused the foregoing document described as: RESPONSE OF DEFENDANT BIMBO BAKERIES USA, INC. TO PLAINTIFFS' FIRST SET OF REQUESTS FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS to be served on the interested parties in this action as follows:			
8		Ananda N. Chaudhuri Ben F. Pierce Gore		
9		Keith M. Fleischman Bradley F. Silverman Pratt & Associates 1871 The Alameda, Suite 425		
10		Fleischman Law Firm San Jose, CA 95126 565 Fifth Avenue, 7th Floor T: 408-369-0800 New York, NY 10017 pgore@prattattorneys.com		
11		T: 212-880-9567 achaudhuri@fleischmanlawfirm.com		
12		keith@fleischmanlawfirm.com bsilverman@fleischmanlawfirm.com		
13	ראז	BY U.S. MAIL. I sealed said envelope and placed it for collection and mailing following		
14	[X]	ordinary business practices. by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Los Angeles, California		
15		addressed as set forth above.		
16	[X]	BY E-MAIL. I served such document(s) in PDF format to the e-mail address(es) indicated above following ordinary business practices.		
17 18	[]	BY PERSONAL SERVICE: I caused such envelope to be delivered by hand to the individuals listed below		
19		BY OVERNIGHT SERVICE. I caused such document to be delivered by overnight mail		
20		to the offices listed below by placing it for collection by UPS / Federal Express following ordinary business practices by my firm, to wit, that packages will either be picked up from		
21		my firm by UPS / Federal Express and/or delivered by my firm to the UPS / Federal Express office:		
22	[]	(State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on at Los Angeles, California.		
23	[X]	(Federal) I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at		
24		whose direction the service was made. Executed on March 7, 2014, at Los Angeles, California.		
25				
26	Print 1	Gwendolyn Santini Name Signature		
27	J. Hill Timile			
28				
	\\LA - 0997	24/000052 - 1051573 vl		

PROOF OF SERVICE